



Dave Heineman
Governor

NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(Nebraska Crime Commission)

Michael E. Behm, Executive Director

301 Centennial Mall South

P.O. Box 94946

Lincoln, Nebraska 68509-4946

Phone (402) 471-2194

FAX (402) 471-2837

NEBRASKA COMMISSION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE

October 21, 2011

The Nebraska Commission on Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice met Friday, October 21, 2011 at 9:30 AM in Lower Level Conference Room A of the Nebraska State Office Building, 301 Centennial Mall South, Lincoln, Nebraska. Legal notice of the meeting was published October 7, 2011 in the Lincoln Journal Star.

As amended by LB 898, 2005 Legislature, a copy of the Nebraska Open Meetings Act was available for public review.

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:34 AM by Acting Chairman John Freudenberg. The following members were **in attendance**: Acting Chair John Freudenberg, Candice Batton, Joe Kelly, Alex Hayes, Robert Houston, Kathy Moore (arrived at 9:36 AM), Don Overman, Richard Pierce, Fred Ruiz, Rita Sanders, Brenda Smith, Derek Vaughn and William White. **Members excused**: Bill Brueggemann, Scot Ford, Genelle Moore, and David Sankey. **Staff present**: Lynn Mulson, Michael Behm, William Muldoon, Michael Overton, Nick Steele, Lisa Stamm, Merry Wills, Cindy Gans, Chris Harris, Linda Krutz, Liza Alderman, Bruce Ayers, James Wright, David Stolz, and Ann Bauers.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion

A motion was made by Batton and seconded by Overman to approve the minutes of the Police Standards Advisory Council meetings of May 18, 2011 and July 20, 2011; Crime Commission meeting of July 22, 2011; Jail Standards Board meeting of July 29, 2011; Racial Profiling Advisory Committee meeting of September 16, 2011; Nebraska Coalition for Juvenile Justice meeting of September 9, 2011; and the Office of Violence Prevention meeting of September 20, 2011. The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

III. PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE REVOCATION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CERTIFICATION OF ALAN KOSMICKI #LR-062-07

Lynn Mulson, Assistant Attorney General gave a procedural overview of the revocation process. She informed the Board that the case file contains the following information: the informal complaint, notice to the officer of the informal complaint, the officer's informal

answer (if any is filed), the Executive Director's correspondence, and the formal complaint filed.

Mulson stated that the case before the Board today was uncontested and there is an avadavat showing publishing of the notice to revoke. Mulson reviewed the case with the Board and offered the file into evidence. She then asked for a motion from the Board to either approve or deny revocation of Mr. Kosmicki's law enforcement certification.

Allen Kosmicki did not attend, nor did he send a representative on his behalf.

Vaughn wanted to make note that this is an open meeting, but the door is closed because of the noise in the adjoining room and hallway.

Motion

A motion was made by White and seconded by K. Moore to uphold the Police Standards Advisory Council's decision to revoke the Law Enforcement certification of Alan M. Kosmicki LR-062-07. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelley, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Vaughn and White. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mike Behm presented a clock to Kathy Moore for her years of service to the Crime Commission. Moore thanked the Board for the award and stated that she appreciated the staff for all their help.

Mike Behm presented his Executive Director's report noting the following:

- Christopher Harris is our new Juvenile Compliance DMC Monitor
- Cindy Gans joins us as the new Federal Aid Juvenile Administrator
- Liza Alderman is our new Staff Assistant II who will be the Crime Victim's Reparations Coordinator
- Nick Steele has been hired for the IT Support Analyst position.

V. OLD BUSINESS

A. No Old Business

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Final Revocation Decision LR-043-05; Jason S. Fisher

Dave Stolz, Agency Council for the Crime Commission, gave a procedural overview of the revocation process. He informed the Board that all revocation hearing files contain the following information: the informal complaint, notice to the officer of the informal complaint, the officer's informal answer (if any is filed), the Executive Director's correspondence, the formal complaint filed and the respondent officer's

consent decree to the revocation action, which is essentially a voluntary relinquishment of the officer's certificate.

He stated that each hearing will be handled separately and will require a separate vote.

Stolz began with the revocation hearing of Jason S. Fisher, LR-043-05. He gave a brief summary of the reasons for the revocation. He stated the file, marked as Exhibit 1, was presented to the Council for a formal hearing with the basis of revocation being misrepresentation of a GED. Stolz stated that this revocation was uncontested and Fisher signed a consent decree which is in the file. Stolz next offered the file into evidence and asked for a motion from the Board to either approve or deny revocation of Mr. Fisher's law enforcement certification.

Batton questioned why if this happened in 2005 it has taken so long to be presented for revocation. Stolz stated there were a number of reasons, but it was handled in as timely a manner as possible. Houston asked how long Fisher had worked, and Stolz answered he was still employed at the time of this revocation. He has now been fired.

Motion

A motion was made by Hayes and seconded by Sanders to uphold the Police Standards Advisory Council's decision to revoke the Law Enforcement certification of Jason S. Fisher, LR-043-95. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn and White. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Final Revocation Decision LR-036-05; Michael S. Capps

Stolz moved to the revocation hearing of Michael S. Capps, LR-036-05. He gave a brief summary of the reasons for the revocation. He stated the file, marked as Exhibit 1, was presented to the Council for a formal hearing with the basis of revocation being he was charged and convicted of official misconduct. Stolz stated that this revocation was uncontested and Capps signed a consent decree which is in the file. Stolz next offered the file into evidence and asked for a motion from the Board to either approve or deny revocation of Mr. Capp's law enforcement certification.

Motion

A motion was made by Hayes and seconded by Overman to uphold the Police Standards Advisory Council's decision to revoke the Law Enforcement certification of Michael S. Capps, LR-036-05. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn, and White. Motion carried unanimously.

C. Nebraska Law Enforcement Training Center

1. Instructor Certifications

The Crime Commission next considered two requests for **Professional Instructor Certification**, two requests for **Professional Instructor Recertification**, one request for **Legal Certification** and one request for **General Certification**. Police Standards Advisory Council's recommendations were reported by William Muldoon

Motion

A motion was made by Vaughn and seconded by White to grant the following instructor certifications per Police Standards Advisory Council's recommendations: Professional Certification to Nate Jacobsen, Nebraska State Patrol; Jeremy J. Schwarz, Lancaster County Sheriff's Office for N.L.E.T.C.; Professional Recertification to Jeffrey J. Bliemeister, Lancaster County Sheriff's Office for N.L.E.T.C.; William T. Price, Nebraska State Patrol; Legal Recertification to Frederick Kin, Nebraska State Patrol; and General Certification to Amy L. Merritt, Lancaster County Sheriff's Office for N.L.E.T.C. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Vaughn and White. Motion carried unanimously.

D. Revision Recommendation to Operating Instruction #2

SEE ATTACHMENT #1

Behm presented his recommendation for changing Operating Instruction #2. He proposed changing the numbers of members of the Nebraska Juveniles Services Grant Committee be changed from nineteen (19) to six (6). This request is being recommended to bring the number of members consistent with the Crime Commission Grant Committee and lessen fiscal impact when the committees meet. Behm further stated that this would still be in compliance with the guidelines.

Hayes asked if any counties would be affected by making it a smaller group. Stamm stated it would not. Freudenberg asked how the six members would be selected. Stamm stated that they would still come from the Juvenile Justice Coalition which has 33 members. This change would make it consistent with other Grant Review Committees. Stamm further stated that having 19 members is very timely and costly, not only for administrative purposes, but also for the State Advisory funds which they'd like to use for other purposes. Stamm assured the board that they would ask for volunteers and insure that it would be representative from across the state and be made up of members from the Juvenile Justice Coalition.

Ruiz stated that six is a pretty small number, and what will happen if someone is sick or can't make it. Freudenberg suggested that Stamm report back to the board on how the change is working and if it looks like it needs to be modified to a higher number this can be re-visited.

Vaughn stated that with so many people the process just gets bogged down and with the six members the grant process can be moved along more efficiently. He further stated with 33 members on the Coalition there won't be a problem with getting six people to serve on the committee or find substitutes. K. Moore agreed that 19 are too many for a committee.

Motion

A motion was made by Hayes and seconded by Overman to revise Operating Instruction #2. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn, and White. Motion carried unanimously.

E. Revision Recommendation to Operating Instruction #41

SEE HANDOUT

Behm presented his recommendation for changing Operating Instruction #41. He stated that there are three lines to be removed for Operating Instruction #41 per the handout. Number 4, paragraph A would take out "application form and financial resource form". Number 4, paragraph B would take out "such file shall be secured in a locking file cabinet" And paragraph G would take out the phrase "The letter shall be signed by the Administrator of the program."

Behm deferred questions to Bruce Ayers. Ayers gave a brief explanation on the update of OI #41. Kelly asked if OIs were the same as Rules and Regulations. Stolz stated an OI is for the internal operation of the Agency.

Motion

A motion was made by Ruiz and seconded by Smith to revise Operating Instruction #41. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn, and White. Motion carried unanimously.

F. Approval of remaining \$50,000 VAWA ARRA funds to Douglas County

Lisa Stamm stated there was a remaining amount that had to be moved from Administration funds before the end of the year. She gave a summary of how the funds would be used for the Sexual Assault Initiative Project for Douglas County.

Smith asked if there would be any commitment in the future. Vaughn stated that this would be a onetime funding, and they would be looking for other funding amounts from other sources. K. Moore asked if these funds had to be publicly advertised. Stamm answered that because they were moving from one fund to another they did not. Batton asked if anyone else was notified about the availability of funding, and Stamm stated because of the time restraint and the timing of the request, they did not.

Motion

A motion was made by K. Moore and seconded by Sanders to approve the remaining \$50,000 VAWA ARRA funds to Douglas County. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, and White. Abstaining from the motion: Hayes and Vaughn. Motion carried unanimously.

G. County Aid Formula Approval

SEE ATTACHMENT #2

Cindy Gans gave a brief summary of the County Aid Formula and the changes that will be happening in the upcoming year.

Motion

A motion was made by K. Moore and seconded by White to approve the County Aid Formula. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn and White. Motion carried unanimously.

H. Approval of VOCA Grant #11-VA-241 for the Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition in the amount of \$29,301.

Merry Wills gave a brief background of the VOCA Grant #11-VA-241. The reason these funds are available is because Scottsbluff County has declined their award of \$29,301 because of a conflict of interest. Therefore, these funds are available for the Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition who recently lost some of their funding.

White asked why Lexington lost their funds, and Wills replied that because the funds are discretionary, there could be various reasons. There was a brief discussion on Federal funding.

Freudenberg suggested that in the future notification of availability of funds should be sent out before funds are allocated. Batton asked why Scottsbluff declined the funding. Wills stated that the letter received from Scottsbluff indicated a conflict of interest in the use of the funds with VOCA rules.

Motion

A motion was made by Vaughn and seconded by K. Moore to approve the VOCA Grant #11-VA-241 for the Nebraska Domestic Violence Sexual Assault Coalition in the amount of \$29,301. Voting in favor of the motion: Batton, Kelly, Hayes, Houston, K. Moore, Overman, Pierce, Ruiz, Sanders, Smith, Vaughn and White. Motion carried unanimously.

VII. OTHER BUSINESS

Overman asked about the status of the Sheriff of Sioux County. Muldoon answered that he was still enrolled at the Law Enforcement Training Center at the current time. The PSAC has waived the eight month rule for him.

Ruiz asked what the status of RAPP was. Behm answered that there were a couple of meetings planned, but they had not happened at this time.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public present who wished to address the Board at this time.

IX. ADJOURNMENT

The next scheduled meeting of the Commission will be **Friday, January 27, 2012 at 9:30 AM in the Nebraska State Office Building, Lower Level Conference Room A, Lincoln, Nebraska.**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:31 AM.

Respectfully Submitted,



Ann Bauers
Administrative Assistant

Attachment #1

Crime Commission

Operating Instruction #2

Commission organization, Committee Assignments and Meeting Procedures

Revision Recommendation

Section 8

Paragraph C

Nebraska Juveniles Services Grant Committee: This committee consists of ~~nineteen-six~~ members who serve according to the provisions of Neb. Rev. §43-2411.

*This request is being recommended to bring the number of members consistent with the Crime Commission Grant Committee and lessen fiscal impact when the committee's meet.

Attachment #2

September 27, 2011

Nebraska Crime Commission
Michael E. Behm, Executive Director
301 Centennial Mall South
PO Box 94946
Lincoln, Ne 68509-4946


Dear Nebraska Crime Commission,

As the Chair of the Nebraska Coalition for Juvenile Justice I would like to report back to the Nebraska Crime Commission regarding the County Aid formulas presented to us by Hank Robinson, Director of the Consortium for Crime and Justice Research, within the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at the University of Nebraska – Omaha. At our September 9th, 2011 Coalition meeting Mr. Hank Robinson presented 2 separate County Aid formulas for review and discussion.

The first formula was a Straight Formula based on the 2010 formula which is based solely off the number of youth per county with no other factors. The second formula is based off a minimum amount for every county. In this formula Mr. Robinson set the minimum amount at \$2500 for every county whose youth population was below a certain level. By setting the minimum amount at \$2500 Mr. Robinson thought this may give the counties who have not applied for County Aid monies in the past, more incentive to do so in the future.

The Nebraska Coalition for Juvenile Justice made a motion of recommendation to the Nebraska Crime Commission to utilize Mr. Robinson's second formula based on a County's percentage of Nebraska's total population with the Minimum of \$2500 for the smallest counties. We felt that this option may also encourage more counties to work together regionally to use their County Aid dollars.

Sincerely,



Mark Benne

Nebraska Coalition for Juvenile Justice, Chairman

COUNTY AID FORMULA BASED ON 2010 CENSUS

43-2404.02. County Juvenile Services Aid Program; created; use; reports.

(2) The annual General Fund appropriation to the County Juvenile Services Aid Program shall be apportioned to the counties as aid in accordance with a formula established in rules and regulations adopted and promulgated by the commission. *The formula shall be based on the total number of residents per county who are twelve years of age through eighteen years of age and other relevant factors as determined by the commission.*

2010 CENSUS – 12 TO 18 YEAR-OLDS PER COUNTY

Based on the 2010 Census of 12 to 18 year-olds per county in Nebraska compared to the 2000 Census:

- 86 out of 93 counties lost 12 to 18 year-olds, 1 county (Keya Paha) stayed the same, and 6 out of 93 counties gained youth in that age bracket (Webster, Dakota, Hall, Sarpy, Lancaster, and Douglas Counties).
- The largest 3 counties—Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy—account for over 51% of the state's population of 12 to 18 year-olds.
- 27 counties have less than 300 12 to 18 year-old youth.

PRINCIPLES IN DETERMINING THE 2010 COUNTY AID FORMULA

Funding is based on a formula that:

1. Is fair and equitable.
2. Distributes funds in a way that will promote improved capacity throughout the state.
3. Provides incentives for counties to apply for County Aid.
4. Encourages lower-populated counties to collaborate.

2 OPTIONS FOR THE 2010 COUNTY AID FORMULA

Option A – Straight Formula (Calculated Amounts Attached)

Keep the formula the same as it was in 2010; the formula is adopted based solely on number of youth per county with no other considering factors.

Option B – Minimum Amount for Every County (Calculated Amounts Attached)

The formula is adopted that considers a minimum dollar amount going to counties at and below a certain youth population. In what is presented here, every county would receive at least a \$2,500 allotment.

COUNTY AID ENHANCEMENT FUNDS

To incentivize collaboration between counties of lower populations, the Commission could prioritize a portion of County Aid Enhancement funds for counties applying for County Aid *regionally*. For example, if four or more counties collaborate and submit a joint County Aid Enhancement application, priority for Enhancement dollars will be given to counties that have four or more counties collaborating and submitting a joint application. The pot of money designated for such could be set at \$50,000.

Compiled by:

T. Hank Robinson, Ph.d. & Julie Rogers, J.D.

Juvenile Justice Institute - Consortium for Crime & Justice Research

University of Nebraska

Allocation of County Aid Funding based on a County's percentage of Nebraska's Total Population

Area	2000 Age 12-18 Population	2010 Age 12-18 Population	% of Total 12-18 Population in NE	2000 Allotment	2010 Straight Formula	Difference	% Change
Arthur	52	44	0.03	\$419	\$375	-44	-10.4%
McPherson	70	48	0.03	\$564	\$409	-155	-27.4%
Blaine	73	54	0.03	\$588	\$461	-127	-21.7%
Grant	126	54	0.03	\$1,016	\$461	-555	-54.7%
Thomas	90	56	0.03	\$725	\$478	-247	-34.1%
Loup	92	59	0.03	\$742	\$503	-239	-32.2%
Banner	115	68	0.04	\$927	\$580	-347	-37.4%
Logan	107	69	0.04	\$863	\$588	-275	-31.8%
Hooker	97	71	0.04	\$782	\$606	-176	-22.6%
Keya Paha	84	84	0.05	\$677	\$716	39	5.8%
Wheeler	107	97	0.06	\$863	\$827	-36	-4.1%
Rock	206	111	0.06	\$1,661	\$947	-714	-43.0%
Hayes	141	113	0.06	\$1,137	\$964	-173	-15.2%
Sioux	162	114	0.07	\$1,306	\$972	-334	-25.6%
Deuel	258	153	0.09	\$2,080	\$1,305	-775	-37.3%
Garden	250	170	0.10	\$2,015	\$1,450	-565	-28.0%
Gosper	235	183	0.10	\$1,894	\$1,561	-333	-17.6%
Dundy	252	199	0.11	\$2,031	\$1,697	-334	-16.4%
Boyd	308	200	0.11	\$2,483	\$1,706	-777	-31.3%
Garfield	214	207	0.12	\$1,725	\$1,765	40	2.3%
Greeley	321	234	0.13	\$2,588	\$1,996	-592	-22.9%
Hitchcock	364	234	0.13	\$2,934	\$1,996	-938	-32.0%
Pawnee	298	273	0.16	\$2,402	\$2,328	-74	-3.1%
Perkins	400	276	0.16	\$3,224	\$2,354	-870	-27.0%
Sherman	356	278	0.16	\$2,870	\$2,371	-499	-17.4%
Brown	412	289	0.17	\$3,321	\$2,465	-856	-25.8%
Frontier	405	294	0.17	\$3,265	\$2,507	-758	-23.2%
Franklin	396	308	0.18	\$3,192	\$2,627	-565	-17.7%
Harlan	406	329	0.19	\$3,273	\$2,806	-467	-14.3%
Kimball	460	343	0.20	\$3,708	\$2,925	-783	-21.1%
Chase	491	352	0.20	\$3,958	\$3,002	-956	-24.2%
Nance	513	362	0.21	\$4,135	\$3,087	-1048	-25.3%
Nuckolls	602	363	0.21	\$4,835	\$3,096	-1739	-36.0%
Valley	499	380	0.22	\$4,022	\$3,241	-781	-19.4%
Johnson	494	396	0.23	\$3,982	\$3,377	-605	-15.2%
Webster	395	402	0.23	\$3,184	\$3,428	244	7.7%
Thayer	621	474	0.27	\$5,006	\$4,042	-964	-19.2%
Morrill	701	477	0.27	\$5,651	\$4,068	-1583	-28.0%
Sheridan	729	502	0.29	\$5,877	\$4,281	-1596	-27.2%
Polk	631	511	0.29	\$5,087	\$4,358	-729	-14.3%
Furnas	567	519	0.30	\$4,571	\$4,426	-145	-3.2%
Cherry	712	545	0.31	\$5,739	\$4,648	-1091	-19.0%
Boone	810	590	0.34	\$6,529	\$5,032	-1497	-22.9%
Jefferson	860	610	0.35	\$6,933	\$5,202	-1731	-25.0%
Antelope	975	621	0.35	\$7,860	\$5,296	-2564	-32.6%
Burt	890	626	0.36	\$7,174	\$5,339	-1835	-25.6%
Dixon	782	643	0.37	\$6,304	\$5,484	-820	-13.0%
Howard	817	644	0.37	\$6,586	\$5,492	-1094	-16.6%
Kearney	803	651	0.37	\$6,473	\$5,552	-921	-14.2%
Stanton	862	654	0.37	\$6,949	\$5,578	-1371	-19.7%
Fillmore	812	656	0.37	\$6,546	\$5,595	-951	-14.5%
Clay	923	676	0.39	\$7,440	\$5,765	-1675	-22.5%

Area	2000 Age 12-18 Population	2010 Age 12-18 Population	% of Total 12-18 Population in NE	2000 Allotment	2010 Straight Formula	Difference	% Change
Nemaha	847	698	0.40	\$6,828	\$5,953	-875	-12.8%
Keith	1034	741	0.42	\$8,335	\$6,319	-2016	-24.2%
Richardson	1123	772	0.44	\$9,053	\$6,584	-2469	-27.3%
Pierce	1052	805	0.46	\$8,480	\$6,865	-1615	-19.0%
Merrick	958	823	0.47	\$7,723	\$7,019	-704	-9.1%
Thurston	1017	854	0.49	\$8,198	\$7,283	-915	-11.2%
Knox	1075	871	0.50	\$8,666	\$7,428	-1238	-14.3%
Dawes	1020	878	0.50	\$8,222	\$7,488	-734	-8.9%
Phelps	1084	881	0.50	\$8,738	\$7,513	-1225	-14.0%
Butler	1096	888	0.51	\$8,835	\$7,573	-1262	-14.3%
Cheyenne	1141	911	0.52	\$9,198	\$7,769	-1429	-15.5%
Cuming	1216	924	0.53	\$9,802	\$7,880	-1922	-19.6%
Wayne	1117	925	0.53	\$9,004	\$7,889	-1115	-12.4%
Cedar	1259	967	0.55	\$10,149	\$8,247	-1902	-18.7%
Holt	1455	1,030	0.59	\$11,729	\$8,784	-2945	-25.1%
Hamilton	1166	1,045	0.60	\$9,309	\$8,912	-397	-4.3%
Colfax	1222	1,049	0.60	\$9,851	\$8,946	-905	-9.2%
Custer	1332	1,056	0.60	\$10,737	\$9,006	-1731	-16.1%
Red Willow	1240	1,056	0.60	\$9,996	\$9,006	-990	-9.9%
Box Butte	1505	1,113	0.64	\$12,132	\$9,492	-2640	-21.8%
York	1695	1,292	0.74	\$13,664	\$11,019	-2645	-19.4%
Saline	1544	1,466	0.84	\$12,446	\$12,503	57	0.5%
Otoe	1726	1,538	0.88	\$13,913	\$13,117	-796	-5.7%
Seward	1940	1,713	0.98	\$15,639	\$14,609	-1030	-6.6%
Gage	2405	2,027	1.16	\$19,387	\$17,287	-2100	-10.8%
Saunders	2329	2,182	1.25	\$18,774	\$18,609	-165	-0.9%
Washington	2209	2,194	1.25	\$17,807	\$18,711	904	5.1%
Dakota	2332	2,382	1.36	\$18,799	\$20,314	1515	8.1%
Cass	2739	2,616	1.49	\$22,079	\$22,310	231	1.0%
Dawson	2684	2,646	1.51	\$21,636	\$22,566	930	4.3%
Adams	3156	3,001	1.71	\$25,441	\$25,594	153	0.6%
Platte	3889	3,340	1.91	\$31,350	\$28,485	-2865	-9.1%
Dodge	3831	3,417	1.95	\$30,882	\$29,141	-1741	-5.6%
Madison	4123	3,450	1.97	\$33,236	\$29,423	-3813	-11.5%
Lincoln	3814	3,455	1.97	\$30,745	\$29,465	-1280	-4.2%
Scotts Bluff	3994	3,495	2.00	\$32,196	\$29,807	-2389	-7.4%
Buffalo	4672	4,323	2.47	\$37,662	\$36,868	-794	-2.1%
Hall	5559	5,839	3.34	\$44,812	\$49,797	4985	11.1%
Sarpy	14029	16,249	9.28	\$113,089	\$138,577	25488	22.5%
Lancaster	23655	24,217	13.84	\$190,686	\$206,531	15845	8.3%
Douglas	47518	49,210	28.12	\$383,048	\$419,679	36631	9.6%
Nebraska Totals	185148	175005	100	\$1,492,500			

Population Data Source: 2010 Census (SF 1, PCT12), U.S. Census Bureau

Compiled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on Tuesday July 12, 2011

Formula Calculations and Table by:

T. Hank Robinson, Ph.d. and Julie Rogers, J.D.

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice: CCJR

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Omaha

Allocation of County Aid Funding based on a County's percentage of
Nebraska's Total Population with Minimum Amount for Smallest Counties

Area	2000 Age 12-18 Population	2010 Age 12-18 Population	% of Total 12-18 Population in NE	2000 Allotment	2010 Straight Formula with Min. Am't	Difference	% Change
Arthur	52	44	0.03	\$419	\$2,500	2081	496.7%
McPherson	70	48	0.03	\$564	\$2,500	1936	343.3%
Blaine	73	54	0.03	\$588	\$2,500	1912	325.2%
Grant	126	54	0.03	\$1,016	\$2,500	1484	146.1%
Thomas	90	56	0.03	\$725	\$2,500	1775	244.8%
Loup	92	59	0.03	\$742	\$2,500	1758	236.9%
Banner	115	68	0.04	\$927	\$2,500	1573	169.7%
Logan	107	69	0.04	\$863	\$2,500	1637	189.7%
Hooker	97	71	0.04	\$782	\$2,500	1718	219.7%
Keya Paha	84	84	0.05	\$677	\$2,500	1823	269.3%
Wheeler	107	97	0.06	\$863	\$2,500	1637	189.7%
Rock	206	111	0.06	\$1,661	\$2,500	839	50.5%
Hayes	141	113	0.06	\$1,137	\$2,500	1363	119.9%
Sioux	162	114	0.07	\$1,306	\$2,500	1194	91.4%
Deuel	258	153	0.09	\$2,080	\$2,500	420	20.2%
Garden	250	170	0.10	\$2,015	\$2,500	485	24.1%
Gosper	235	183	0.10	\$1,894	\$2,500	606	32.0%
Dundy	252	199	0.11	\$2,031	\$2,500	469	23.1%
Boyd	308	200	0.11	\$2,483	\$2,500	17	0.7%
Garfield	214	207	0.12	\$1,725	\$2,500	775	44.9%
Greeley	321	234	0.13	\$2,588	\$2,500	-88	-3.4%
Hitchcock	364	234	0.13	\$2,934	\$2,500	-434	-14.8%
Pawnee	298	273	0.16	\$2,402	\$2,500	98	4.1%
Perkins	400	276	0.16	\$3,224	\$2,500	-724	-22.5%
Sherman	356	278	0.16	\$2,870	\$2,500	-370	-12.9%
Brown	412	289	0.17	\$3,321	\$2,500	-821	-24.7%
Frontier	405	294	0.17	\$3,265	\$2,500	-765	-23.4%
Franklin	396	308	0.18	\$3,192	\$2,567	-625	-19.6%
Harlan	406	329	0.19	\$3,273	\$2,742	-531	-16.2%
Kimball	460	343	0.20	\$3,708	\$2,859	-849	-22.9%
Chase	491	352	0.20	\$3,958	\$2,934	-1024	-25.9%
Nance	513	362	0.21	\$4,135	\$3,017	-1118	-27.0%
Nuckolls	602	363	0.21	\$4,835	\$3,025	-1810	-37.4%
Valley	499	380	0.22	\$4,022	\$3,167	-855	-21.3%
Johnson	494	396	0.23	\$3,982	\$3,301	-681	-17.1%
Webster	395	402	0.23	\$3,184	\$3,351	167	5.2%
Thayer	621	474	0.27	\$5,006	\$3,951	-1055	-21.1%
Morrill	701	477	0.27	\$5,651	\$3,976	-1675	-29.6%
Sheridan	729	502	0.29	\$5,877	\$4,184	-1693	-28.8%
Polk	631	511	0.29	\$5,087	\$4,259	-828	-16.3%
Furnas	567	519	0.30	\$4,571	\$4,326	-245	-5.4%
Cherry	712	545	0.31	\$5,739	\$4,542	-1197	-20.9%
Boone	810	590	0.34	\$6,529	\$4,917	-1612	-24.7%
Jefferson	860	610	0.35	\$6,933	\$5,084	-1849	-26.7%
Antelope	975	621	0.35	\$7,860	\$5,176	-2684	-34.1%
Burt	890	626	0.36	\$7,174	\$5,217	-1957	-27.3%
Dixon	782	643	0.37	\$6,304	\$5,359	-945	-15.0%
Howard	817	644	0.37	\$6,586	\$5,368	-1218	-18.5%
Kearney	803	651	0.37	\$6,473	\$5,426	-1047	-16.2%
Stanton	862	654	0.37	\$6,949	\$5,451	-1498	-21.6%
Fillmore	812	656	0.37	\$6,546	\$5,468	-1078	-16.5%
Clay	923	676	0.39	\$7,440	\$5,634	-1806	-24.3%

Area	2000 Age 12-18 Population	2010 Age 12-18 Population	% of Total 12-18 Population in NE	2000 Allotment	2010 Straight Formula with Min. Am't	Difference	% Change
Nemaha	847	698	0.40	\$6,828	\$5,818	-1010	-14.8%
Keith	1034	741	0.42	\$8,335	\$6,176	-2159	-25.9%
Richardson	1123	772	0.44	\$9,053	\$6,434	-2619	-28.9%
Pierce	1052	805	0.46	\$8,480	\$6,709	-1771	-20.9%
Merrick	958	823	0.47	\$7,723	\$6,859	-864	-11.2%
Thurston	1017	854	0.49	\$8,198	\$7,118	-1080	-13.2%
Knox	1075	871	0.50	\$8,666	\$7,259	-1407	-16.2%
Dawes	1020	878	0.50	\$8,222	\$7,318	-904	-11.0%
Phelps	1084	881	0.50	\$8,738	\$7,343	-1395	-16.0%
Butler	1096	888	0.51	\$8,835	\$7,401	-1434	-16.2%
Cheyenne	1141	911	0.52	\$9,198	\$7,593	-1605	-17.5%
Cuming	1216	924	0.53	\$9,802	\$7,701	-2101	-21.4%
Wayne	1117	925	0.53	\$9,004	\$7,710	-1294	-14.4%
Cedar	1259	967	0.55	\$10,149	\$8,060	-2089	-20.6%
Holt	1455	1,030	0.59	\$11,729	\$8,585	-3144	-26.8%
Hamilton	1166	1,045	0.60	\$9,309	\$8,710	-599	-6.4%
Colfax	1222	1,049	0.60	\$9,851	\$8,743	-1108	-11.2%
Custer	1332	1,056	0.60	\$10,737	\$8,801	-1936	-18.0%
Red Willow	1240	1,056	0.60	\$9,996	\$8,801	-1195	-12.0%
Box Butte	1505	1,113	0.64	\$12,132	\$9,276	-2856	-23.5%
York	1695	1,292	0.74	\$13,664	\$10,768	-2896	-21.2%
Saline	1544	1,466	0.84	\$12,446	\$12,219	-227	-1.8%
Otoe	1726	1,538	0.88	\$13,913	\$12,819	-1094	-7.9%
Seward	1940	1,713	0.98	\$15,639	\$14,277	-1362	-8.7%
Gage	2405	2,027	1.16	\$19,387	\$16,894	-2493	-12.9%
Saunders	2329	2,182	1.25	\$18,774	\$18,186	-588	-3.1%
Washington	2209	2,194	1.25	\$17,807	\$18,286	479	2.7%
Dakota	2332	2,382	1.36	\$18,799	\$19,853	1054	5.6%
Cass	2739	2,616	1.49	\$22,079	\$21,803	-276	-1.2%
Dawson	2684	2,646	1.51	\$21,636	\$22,053	417	1.9%
Adams	3156	3,001	1.71	\$25,441	\$25,012	-429	-1.7%
Platte	3889	3,340	1.91	\$31,350	\$27,838	-3512	-11.2%
Dodge	3831	3,417	1.95	\$30,882	\$28,479	-2403	-7.8%
Madison	4123	3,450	1.97	\$33,236	\$28,755	-4481	-13.5%
Lincoln	3814	3,455	1.97	\$30,745	\$28,796	-1949	-6.3%
Scotts Bluff	3994	3,495	2.00	\$32,196	\$29,130	-3066	-9.5%
Buffalo	4672	4,323	2.47	\$37,662	\$36,031	-1631	-4.3%
Hall	5559	5,839	3.34	\$44,812	\$48,666	3854	8.6%
Sarpy	14029	16,249	9.28	\$113,089	\$135,430	22341	19.8%
Lancaster	23655	24,217	13.84	\$190,686	\$201,840	11154	5.8%
Douglas	47518	49,210	28.12	\$383,048	\$410,148	27100	7.1%
Nebraska Totals	185148	175005	100	\$1,492,500			

Population Data Source: 2010 Census (SF 1, PCT12), U.S. Census Bureau

Compiled by: David Drozd, UNO Center for Public Affairs Research on Tuesday July 12, 2011

Formula Calculations and Table by:

T. Hank Robinson, Ph.d. and Julie Rogers, J.D.

School of Criminology and Criminal Justice: CCJR

UNIVERSITY OF
Nebraska
Omaha